

REMARKS

By this paper, claims 21, 24-28, 33, 38, and 41-44 are amended. No claims added or cancelled. Accordingly, claims 21, 22, 24-30, 32-39, and 41-44 are all of the pending claims. Support for the amendments presented above is provided throughout the specification and claims as originally filed. Applicants expressly reserve the right to prosecute the subject matter of the unamended and/or cancelled claims, or any other subject matter supported by the Specification, in one or more continuation applications. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and allowance of all the pending claims is anticipated.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 21, 22, 25-30, 32-36, 37-39, and 42-44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,633,759 to Kobayashi ("Kobayashi") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,052,735 to Ulrich *et al.* ("Ulrich"), and claims 24 and 41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kobayashi in view of Ulrich, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,308,061 to Criss *et al.* ("Criss"). Applicants traverse these rejections on the grounds that the sections of the references relied on by the Examiner do not teach or suggest each and every feature of these claims, and/or that it would not have been obvious to combine Kobayashi and Ulrich in the manner proposed by the Examiner. Solely in an effort to expedite prosecution, independent claims 28 and 33 have been amended to further clarify various aspects of the claimed invention. The amendments to independent claims 21 and 38 have been made to address formalities, and do not represent an attempt to overcome a rejection, as these claims are believed to be distinguishable over the cited portions of Kobayashi and Ulrich.

I. Claims 21, 22, 24-27, 38, 39, and 42-44

- A. *Kobayashi and Ulrich do not teach or suggest all of the features of claims 21 and 38.*

Independent claims 21 and 38 both recite *inter alia* the following features, which are not taught or suggested in the sections of Kobayashi and Ulrich relied on by the Examiner:

... formatting at least one application output associated with the at least one selected application actions based on a profile of the wireless client device

The Examiner acknowledges that the cited sections of Kobayashi do not teach or suggest “formatting at least one application output associated with the at least one selected application action based on a profile of the wireless client device.” The Office Action, pg. 3. The Examiner alleges that Ulrich teaches this feature at column 14, lines 14-19. This portion of Ulrich describes aspects of forwarding email from a desktop computing platform to a mobile device for opening, *etc.* locally on the mobile device, and, in pertinent part, reads as follows:

If, however, synchronization interface component 108 determines that it is the attachments property which has been modified by the user, synchronization interface component 108 can optionally check the registry maintained by the operating system in desktop computer 4 to determine whether the particular user of mobile device 3 has indicated in user profile information any specific actions to be taken in sending attachments. For example, during an initialization proceeding at desktop 4, the user can set profile parameters which indicate that a specific file converter is to be invoked to convert any attachment to be transferred to mobile device 3 into a format that is understandable by the device. This is indicated by block 126. Col. 14, lines 7-19.

At best, this section of Ulrich teaches that when forwarding emails with attachments to a mobile device to enable the mobile device to open, read, and/or edit the attachments with applications stored and run entirely on the mobile device, a given attachment should be forwarded to the mobile device in a file format that corresponds to an application on the mobile device for manipulating the attachment (*i.e.*, for opening, reading, and/or editing the attachment on the mobile device). By contrast, the “at least one application output” that is formatted in claims 21 and 38 is associated with an “application action” executed “within the server” and selected on the “wireless client device” (see claim 1). In the sections of Ulrich cited by the Examiner, the formatting and forwarding of attachments to a mobile device appears to be performed automatically based on settings configured previously via a desktop computer. As such, these attachments are not an “at least one application output” that is associated with an “application action” selected on a “wireless client device” and executed “within [a] server.” Therefore, the formatting of these attachments is not analogous to the “formatting [of] at least one application output associated with

the at least one selected application actions” recited in claims 21 and 38. For at least this reason the rejection of claims 21 and 38 based on Kobayashi and Ulrich is improper and should be withdrawn.

B. *The Examiner has not demonstrated that it would have been obvious to combine Kobayashi and Ulrich.*

The Examiner has not demonstrated that it would have been obvious to combine Kobayashi and Ulrich in the proposed manner. In order to properly combine the references, the Examiner must provide some rational underpinning for the combination. In rejecting claims 21 and 38, the Examiner has not met this burden.

The portions of Kobayashi cited in the rejection appear to describe a system in which software operating on a personal computer (e.g., a laptop) is manipulated by inputs to a mobile device (e.g., a cell phone) in communication with the personal computer. The personal computer, in turn, transmits outputs from the manipulated software to the mobile device that enable the mobile device to essentially provide a real-time display of information that corresponds to the display generated by the software for the personal computer as the software is manipulated. See, e.g., the Office Action, pgs. 2 and 3, and Kobayashi, col. 8, line 29-col. 9, line 13.

As was discussed above, the section of Ulrich relied on by the Examiner teach that when forwarding emails with attachments to a mobile device to enable the mobile device to open, read, and/or edit the attachments with applications stored and run entirely on the mobile device, a given attachment should be forwarded to the mobile device in a file format that corresponds to an application on the mobile device for manipulating the attachment (i.e., for opening, reading, and/or editing the attachment on the mobile device). By contrast, in the cited sections of Kobayashi, no attachments, or any other types of files are manipulated on the mobile device. Files are manipulated on the personal computer, and the only information transmitted to the mobile device is display information to enable the generation of a display that corresponds to the manipulation of files (e.g., attachments) on the personal computer. Since no files are transmitted to the mobile device of Kobayashi for local manipulation on the mobile device, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated by the teachings of Ulrich to convert files into a specific file

format to enable manipulation of the files locally on the mobile device. As such, the sections of Kobayashi and Ulrich relied on by the Examiner do not support the proposed combination of the alleged features of Kobayashi and Ulrich. For at least this reason the rejection of claims 21 and 38 based on Kobayashi and Ulrich is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claims 22, 24-27, 39, and 42-44 depend from a corresponding one of claims 21 and 38. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 22, 24-27, 39, and 42-44 based on the cited sections of Kobayashi and Ulrich should be withdrawn due to the dependency of these claims, as well as for the features that they recite individually.

II. Claims 28-30, 32-35, and 37

Independent claims 28 and 33 both been amended to recite *inter alia* the following features, which are not taught or suggested in the sections of Kobayashi and Ulrich relied on by the Examiner:

a forms module that enables the wireless client device to view at least one application output associated with the at least one selected application action, wherein the output is formatted based on a user selection, made on the at least one wireless client device, of one or more fields associated with the at least one file.

The Examiner acknowledges that Kobayashi does not teach or suggest this feature, but contends that the section of Ulrich reproduced above addresses this admitted deficiency of Kobayashi. The Office Action, pg. 3. This portion of Ulrich, as can be seen above, appears to teach selecting file formats for transmission to a mobile device, where the selection is made on a desktop computer, and not the mobile device. Therefore, this section of Ulrich does not teach or suggest “output [that] is formatted based on a user selection, made on the at least one wireless client device, of one or more fields associated with the at least one file.” For at least this reason the rejection of claims 28 and 33 based on the sections of Kobayashi and Ulrich relied on by the Examiner should be withdrawn.

Claims 29, 30, 32, 34, 35, and 37 depend from a corresponding one of claims 28 and 33. As such, the rejection of claims 29, 30, 32, 34, 35, and 37 based on the cited portions of Kobayashi and Ulrich should be withdrawn due to the dependency of these claims, as well as for the features that they recite individually.

III. Claims 24 and 41

Claims 24 and 41 depend from claims 21 and 38, respectively. The sections of Criss relied on by the Examiner do not address the deficiencies of Kobayashi and Ulrich set forth above with respect to claims 21 and 38. As such, the rejection of claims 24 and 41 based on the proposed combination of Kobayashi, Ulrich and Criss should be withdrawn due to the dependency of claims 24 and 41, as well as for the features that they recite individually.

CONCLUSION


Having addressed each of the foregoing objections and rejections, it is respectfully submitted that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is anticipated.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Date: June 10, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By:



D. Benjamin Esplin
Reg. No. 58,297

Customer No. 00909

PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP
1650 Tysons Boulevard
McLean, Virginia 22102
619-234-5000